



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,582	08/23/2001	Dorcen D. Jiang	782.1115	7884
21171	7590	09/20/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			CORRIELUS, JEAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2172	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/934,582	Applicant(s) JIANG ET AL	
	Examiner Jean M Corrielus	Art Unit 2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on May 25, 2004, in which claims 1-26 are presented for further examination.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

#### ***Drawings***

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings that are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement filed on August 23, 2001 (paper no.4) complies with the provisions of M.E.P., 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunkins et al., (hereinafter "Hunkins") US Patent No. 6,141,663 and Patel et al., (hereinafter "Patel") US Patent no. 6,681,257.

As to claim 1, Hunkins discloses the claimed "generating an update request in response to an event that changes subscriber information in a subscriber database messaging system" (col.2, lines 33-46); and "when the update request is generated, automatically updating corresponding subscriber information in the shared central subscriber directory based on the update request" (col.4, lines 13-16 and 25-30; col.5, lines 50-60; col.10, lines 6-67). Hunkins does not explicitly disclose the use of different autonomous telephony messaging systems. However, Hunkins discloses a computer implemented method for synchronizing data in multiple, disparate databases by determining the different format requirements for the different databases, thereby allowing data to be updated automatically without user intervention in order to provide and preserve data integrity and synchronization. On the other hand, Patel discloses a computer implemented method for providing information for a routing of messages between or among messaging platforms in a messaging system by moving messaging platform to different messaging platform (col.2, lines 50-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because one having ordinary skill in the would have found it motivated to utilize such

Art Unit: 2172

a combination would provide Hunkins the enhanced capability of allowing for routing information to be obtained regarding the subscribers of the messaging systems.

As to claim 2, Hunkins discloses the claimed “storing the update event at an intermediate server while maintaining synchronicity between the update event and the local messaging system” (col.4, lines 13-16 and 25-30; col.5, lines 50-60; col.10, lines 6-67).

As to claim 3, Hunkins discloses the claimed “wherein said generating occurs only when information changed in the message box has corresponding information in the shared central subscriber directory” (col.4, lines 13-16 and 25-30; col.5, lines 50-60; col.10, lines 6-67; fig.3).

As to claim 4, Hunkins discloses the claimed “sending the update request from the intermediate server to a proxy client that in turn sends the update request to the shared central subscriber director” (col.4, lines 13-16 and 25-30; col.5, lines 57-65; fig.3).

As to claim 5, Hunkins discloses the claimed “wherein said generating and updating is performed by a plurality of messaging systems that also access the shared central subscriber directory” (fig.3-fig.4; col.4, lines 13-16 and 25-30; col.5, line 5-col.7, line 40).

As to claim 6, Hunkins discloses the claimed “wherein said generating is responsive to a change to a message box initiated by a subscriber telephone call” (col.5, lines 33-60).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 7, Hunkins discloses the claimed "generating an update request for updating the shared subscriber directory server when one of subscriber actions and administrator actions update subscriber information in the voice messaging system" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64); "appending the update request to a queue managed by an update server and in a same order as one of corresponding subscriber actions and corresponding administrator actions occur; reading the update requests, from the queue on a first-in first-out basis" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67); "sending the update requests to the shared Subscriber directory server" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67); and "updating the shared subscriber directory server in real-time based on the update request" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64). Hunkins does not explicitly disclose the use of different autonomous telephony messaging systems. However, Hunkins discloses a computer implemented method for synchronizing data in multiple, disparate databases by determining the different format requirements for the different databases, thereby allowing data to be updated automatically without user intervention in order to provide and preserve data integrity and synchronization. On the other hand, Patel discloses a computer implemented method for providing information for a routing of messages between or among messaging platforms in a messaging system by moving messaging platform to different messaging platform (col.2, lines 50-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because one having ordinary skill in the would have found it motivated to utilize such a combination would provide Hunkins the enhanced capability of allowing for routing information to be obtained regarding the subscribers of the messaging systems.

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 8, Hunkins discloses the claimed “refreshing subscriber information in the update requests, after said reading and before said sending, in accordance with current corresponding subscriber information in the voice messaging system, when the update requests are one of expired and in a queue not primarily associated with the voice messaging system having the subscriber information” (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67).

As to claim 9, Hunkins discloses the claimed “wherein said appending, reading, sending and refreshing are performed by an intermediate server managing the queue, and said generating occurs at one of an application process, an administrative utility, and a bulk data upload utility” (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67).

As to claims 10-11, Hunkins discloses “wherein the bulk data upload utility generates update requests for one of ranges of message boxes in the voice messaging system, all message boxes in the voice messaging system, and ranges of message boxes in the voice messaging system”. (Col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67; fig.3-fig.4; col.5, line 5-col.7, line 40).

As to claim 12, Hunkins discloses the claimed “wherein the subscriber directory resides in a remote, foreign addressing domain and is shared by messaging systems from different vendors” (col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67; fig.3-fig.4; col.5, line 5-col.7, line 40).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 13, Hunkins discloses the claimed "appending the update request to a queue of a second art update server when a primary update server is unavailable"(col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67; fig.3-fig.4; col.5, line 5-col.7, line 40).

As to claim 14, Hunkins discloses the claimed "reading from a second update server the update requests in the queue responsive to a failure impairing the update server" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64).

As to claim 15, Hunkins discloses the claimed "wherein the subscriber action comprises a telephone call that updates the message box of the subscriber". (Col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64).

As to claim 16, Hunkins discloses the claimed "wherein one of subscriber actions and administrator actions comprises ore of creating a message box, deleting a message box, modifying a message box, suspending a message box, reinstating a message box, reinitializing a message box, and migrating a message box from a first voice messaging system to a second voice messaging system" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64).

As to claim 17, Hunkins discloses the claimed "wherein said generating is triggered in an application corresponding to one of the subscriber action and the administrator action" (col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64).



Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 18, Hunkins discloses the claimed "wherein the application corresponding to one of the subscriber action and the administrator action resumes processing immediately after said generating". (Col.7, lines 40-col.8, line 64).

As to claim 19, Hunkins discloses the claimed "wherein said generating is responsive to a change to a message box initiated by a subscriber telephone call" (col.8, lines 6-64).

As to claims 20-21, Hunkins discloses the claimed "determining whether name announcements are attributes of subscriber information that are updated on the shared directory server" (fig.3-fig.4; col.7, lines 40-col.8, lines 64, col.10, lines 6-67; fig.3-fig.4; col.5, line 5-col.7, line 40).

As to claims 22-26:

The limitations of claims 22-26 have been noted in the rejection above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

#### **Remark**

(A). Applicant asserted that Hukins cannot use a central directory to route messages. The examiner disagrees with the precedent assertion. Applicants should duly note that Hukins for synchronizing data in multiple, disparate databases, thereby providing greater accuracy and preserving data integrity. Hunkins states that in most common practice is essential to have a common database exist on a network file server. When a change made to the common database, the information in a record of the common database is placed on the screen for the user, the user

Art Unit: 2172

modifies one or more fields in the record and then saves or commits those changes to the centralized database (item 70 of fig.3 and 4) visible to the network (col.7, lines 40-60).

Therefore, the aforementioned assertion is moot.

(B). Applicant asserted that Hukins does not discuss an automated update process driven or actuated by changes in a database when they occur. The examiner disagrees with the precedent assertion. It is important to note that the feature that applicants are relied upon is well disclosed in Hukins' reference. In fact, Hukins discloses the use of allowing data to be updated or synchronized automatically without user intervention, thereby providing and preserving data integrity. It is clear in col.2, lines 48-58, that Hukins recognizes that manually update is extremely common method, wherein in a large human error factor is introduced and it is difficult if not impossible to have all of data perfectly synchronized. The aforementioned assertion is moot.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(A). US Patent no. 5,657,376, issued to Espeut et al on 08/12/1997. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-26 (e.g. voice message systems).

(B). US Patent no.5,913,032, issued to Schwartz et al on 6/15/1999. The subject matter therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-26 (e.g. accessing shared information).

(C). US Patent no 6,564,321, issued to Bobo, II on 5/13/2003. The subject matter therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-26 (e.g. message storage and deliver system).

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (703) 306-3035. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (12:00pm - 7:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2172

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jean M. Corrielus

Patent Examiner

September 15, 2004